Remarks

The July 1, 2010 Office Action:

(a) objected to claim 11 as purportedly not further limiting claim 1;

(b) held claims 1-6 and 8-17 anticipated based on U.S. patent 5,714,166 ("Tomalia et al.), as evidenced by previously cited Mijovic et al. and Encyclopedia Britannica Online, and as further evidenced by the newly cited IUPAC excerpt;

(c) held claims 1, 3-6, 11-14 and 16 obvious based on U.S. patent application publication 2002/0102434 ("Inoue et al.), as further evidenced by the IUPAC excerpt; and

(d) held claims 2, 8-10, 24, 26-28 and 35-39 obvious based on Inoue et al. with further evidence from the IUPAC excerpt, further in view of a Baldo et al. article.

In view of the amendment above and remarks below, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Nature Of Amendment

In claim 1, and thus all claims dependent thereon, the dendrimers A and B have been described as being phosphorescent organometallic dendrimers. This is based on the disclosure at page 19, lines 1, 2, 20 and 21 of the published PCT specification (i.e. original claims 10 and 17).

In consequence of the amendment to claim 1, claims 8, 9, 10 and 17 have been canceled.

Claim 11 Objection

The claim 11 objection is respectfully traversed. In claim 11 the at least one dendron which is of a different generation in A and B is specified as the one inherently at least partially conjugated. Claim 1 doesn't necessarily require the at least partially conjugated dendron to be one of a different generation. Hence, claim 11 does narrow claim 1.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 1-6 and 8-17 were held anticipated based on Tomalia et al., as evidenced by Mijovic et al., Encyclopedia Britannica Online, and a IUPAC excerpt.

The composition defined in amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Tomalia et al. because Tomalia et al. does not disclose a composition comprising a mixture of at least two

different dendrimers A and B, which:

- have the same core and repeating units but a different generation number and/or different number of dendrons; and

- are both phosphorescent; and

- are both organometallic; and

- both have at least one inherently at least partially conjugated dendron.

The Office Action points to the disclosure at col. 11, lines 64 to 66 of Tomalia et al., which states that the dendrimers of Tomalia et al. can be indicated by their generation number and the initiator core used, e.g. G7 (EDA) dendrimer. The Applicants note that this type of "Gn (core)" notation only provides the generation number and the initiator core of the dendrimer. It does not provide any information as to the structure of the dendrons in the dendrimer. In particular, it does not provide any information as to the chemical structure of the repeat units in the dendrons.

The Office Action then points to the passage at col. 44, lines 37 to 42 of Tomalia et al., which refers to "combinations of two different size dendrimers complexed with DNA". However, no information is given as to the chemical structures of the two different dendrimers in the combinations referred to.

The Office Action then points to Example 42 of Tomalia et al. (col. 104-105), which refers to various particular blends of dendrimers, including blends P and Q. However, the only information given about the structures of the dendrimers in these blends is provided in the form of "Gn (core)" type notation. As noted above, this type of notation does not provide the chemical structure of the repeat units in the dendrons. Thus, the only information given about the structures of the dendrimers in blends P and Q is:

(a) the generation number (which varies from G1 to G6); and

(b) the initiator core (which is either EDA or NH_3).

Tomalia et al. is silent as to the structures of the repeat units in the dendrimers of blends P and Q, and in the dendrimers of the "combinations" referred to at col. 44, lines

37 to 42.

Example 42 (col. 104-105) of Tomalia et al. does indicate that the dendrimers in the blends P and Q are "dense star dendrimers". The term "dense star" however does not provide any information about the repeat units either. Indeed, col. 11, lines 45 to 62 of Tomalia et al. defines what is meant by a "dense star dendrimer", and this definition does not specify any particular chemical structure for the repeat unit in the dendrimer. Indeed, col. 11, lines 60 to 62 of Tomalia et al. states:

> "to have the properties of a dense star dendrimer all of the above three architectural features must be present",

The three architectural features in question are:

> "(a) an initiator core, (b) interior layers (generations, G or Gen) composed of repeating units, radially attached to the initiator core, and (c) an exterior surface of terminal functionality (i.e., terminal functional groups) attached to the outermost generation."

Col. 11, lines 51 to 58 then indicates that the size and shape of the dendrimer and the functional groups present can be controlled by the "choice of the repeating units" employed at each generation. This indicates that the term "dense star dendrimer" does not refer to any particular repeating unit.

It is therefore clear that the expression "dense star dendrimer", as used in Example 42 of Tomalia et al. to describe the dendrimers in blends P and Q, does not provide any information about the structure of the repeating units in the dendrimers of blends P and Q.

It must therefore be concluded that the passages of Tomalia et al. upon which the Examiner relies as disclosing a blend of two different dendrimers do not provide any information on the chemical structures of the repeating units in the dendrimers in the blends.

Although other parts of Tomalia et al. do refer to specific types of dendrimers (see, for instance, col. 14, lines 56 and 57, which refers to polyamidoamine dendrimers, and col. 13, line 62, which refers to polyethyleneimines) they do not relate to blends of two or more dendrimers, and they do

not disclose the chemical structure of the repeating units in a first dendrimer, A, in a blend, and the chemical structures of the repeating units in a second dendrimer, B, in the same blend. These other parts of Tomalia et al. which describe specific types of dendrimers, including polyamidoamine dendrimers, do not therefore anticipate the subject matter defined in instant claim 1.

It is therefore clear that the only sections of Tomalia et al. which do relate to combinations of different dendrimers (namely col. 44, lines 37 to 42 and columns 104-105), do not disclose the chemical structures of the repeating units in those dendrimers.

The following conclusions can therefore be drawn:

First, Tomalia et al. does not disclose a composition comprising a mixture of at least two different dendrimers, A and B, which have the same core and "the same repeating unit or units", as defined in claim 1.

This is because the parts of Tomalia et al. which relate to combinations of dendrimers (namely col. 44, lines 37 to 42 and columns 104-105) do not disclose the chemical structures of the repeating units in the dendrimers. It cannot therefore be concluded that the two or more dendrimers referred to at col. 44, lines 37 to 42 of Tomalia et al., or in the blends of dendrimers P and Q in Example 42 of Tomalia et al., have "the same repeating unit or units". This subject matter is simply not disclosed in Tomalia et al.

Second, Tomalia et al. does not disclose a composition comprising a mixture of at least two different dendrimers, A and B, which have "at least one inherently at least partially conjugated dendron", as defined in claim 1.

Indeed, given that the parts of Tomalia et al. which relate to combinations of dendrimers (namely col. 44, lines 37 to 42 and columns 104-105) do not disclose the chemical structures of the repeating units in those dendrimers, it cannot be concluded that the dendrimers in the disclosed combinations have "at least one inherently at least partially conjugated dendron".

The meaning of the term "inherently at least partially

conjugated dendron" is explained at page 6, lines 22 to 25 of the published PCT specification, which states:

> "an inherently at least partially conjugated dendron means a dendron that has conjugation between the branching groups and linking units (if present) of the dendron, but because of the arrangement of the branching points the pi-system is not necessarily fully delocalised."

The passages of Tomalia et al. which relate to combinations of dendrimers (namely col. 44, lines 37 to 42 and columns 104-105) do not teach that the dendrimers in the disclosed blends meet the condition of having at least one "inherently at least partially conjugated dendron". Indeed, in order to determine whether a dendron is "inherently at least partially conjugated", the skilled person needs to know the chemical structures of the repeating units in the dendrons, so it can then be ascertained whether or not the dendron has the required conjugation between the branching groups and linking units (if present) of the dendron, and therefore whether or not the dendron is "inherently at least partially conjugated". However, the passages at col. 44, lines 37 to 42 and columns 104-105 (Example 42) of Tomalia et al. are silent as to the chemical structures of the dendron repeating units in any of the dendrimers in the blends, and do not therefore allow such a determination to be made. Tomalia et al. does not therefore disclose a composition comprising a mixture of at least two different dendrimers, A and B, which have "at least one inherently at least partially conjugated dendron".

Furthermore, as was discussed in the Applicants' previous responses, none of the dendrimers disclosed in Tomalia et al., including even the dendrimers which are not disclosed as being part of a blend, have "at least one inherently at least partially conjugated dendron". Indeed, the polyamidoamine (PAMAM) dendrimers which are disclosed in Tomalia et al. (although not as part of a blend or combination) are made up of alkyl amides. In these PAMAM compounds, saturated alkylene groups are linked together in dendritic structures by bidentate amide groups and tridentate nitrogen atoms (see the

PAMAM dendrimers described in columns 60 to 62 of Tomalia et al.). The dendrons in the PAMAM dendrimers described in Tomalia et al. therefore contain tridentate nitrogen "branching groups" and saturated alkyl and amide "linking units". The saturated alkyl linking units do not however contain any carbon-carbon double bonds. The dendrons in the PAMAM dendrimers disclosed in Tomalia et al. do not therefore have "conjugation between the branching groups and linking units of the dendron", within the meaning of the definition of an "inherently at least partially conjugated dendron" at page 6, lines 22 to 25 of the published PCT specification. In fact, the dendrons in the PAMAM dendrimers described in Tomalia et al., being fully saturated structures, are not conjugated at all. Clearly, therefore, the PAMAM dendrimers disclosed in Tomalia et al. do not have "at least one inherently at least partially conjugated dendron" as required by instant claim 1.

The Office Action nonetheless refers to the PAMAM dendrimers which are disclosed at column 60, line 19 to column 63, line 9 of Tomalia et al., and points out that these PAMAM dendrimers contain an aniline moiety which is itself a conjugated, aromatic moiety. This aniline moiety, however, is the sole aniline moiety present in each of the dendrimers in question and it is not part of any dendron, but part of the core. Of course, the presence of a sole aniline moiety in the core of a dendrimer has no bearing whatever on whether or not the dendrons of that dendrimer are "inherently at least partially conjugated".

Even though the cores of the dendrimers disclosed at column 60, line 19 to column 63, line 9 of Tomalia et al. contain a sole aniline moiety, none of the dendrons has any such aniline moiety. Rather, the dendrons of the dendrimers disclosed in columns 60-63 of Tomalia et al. are made up entirely of saturated alkylene groups linked together by bidentate amide groups and tridentate nitrogen atoms. As mentioned above, the saturated alkyl linking units do not contain any carbon-carbon double bonds. The dendrons in the PAMAM dendrimers disclosed in columns 60-63 Tomalia et al. do not therefore have "conjugation between the branching groups

and linking units of the dendron", within the meaning of the definition of an "inherently at least partially conjugated dendron" at page 6, lines 22 to 25 of the published PCT specification. In fact, the dendrons are fully saturated and not conjugated at all. Clearly, therefore, the PAMAM dendrimers in columns 60-63 Tomalia et al. do not have "at least one inherently at least partially conjugated dendron" as required by instant claim 1.

Furthermore, of course, the PAMAM dendrimers disclosed in columns 60-63 Tomalia et al. are not disclosed as blends.

It is therefore clear that Tomalia et al. does not disclose a composition comprising a mixture of at least two different dendrimers, A and B, which have "at least one inherently at least partially conjugated dendron", as defined in claim 1.

Tomalia et al. also does not disclose a composition comprising a mixture of at least two different dendrimers, A and B, which are both organometallic dendrimers, as required by amended claim 1.

As explained above, the only sections of Tomalia et al. which relate to combinations of different dendrimers are col. 44, lines 37 to 42 and columns 104-105 (Example 42).

However, the passage at col. 44, lines 37 to 42 of Tomalia et al., which refers to "combinations of two different size dendrimers complexed with DNA", does not provide any information as to the chemical structures of the two different dendrimers in the combinations referred to. That passage certainly does not therefore disclose a composition comprising a mixture of at least two different dendrimers, A and B, which are both organometallic dendrimers.

As for Example 42 (columns 104-105) of Tomalia et al., that describes blends of dendrimers P and Q. As explained above the only information given about the structures of the dendrimers in blends P and Q is the generation number (which varies from G1 to G6) and the initiator core (which is either EDA or NH_3). Clearly, therefore, Example 42 of Tomalia et al. does not disclose any organometallic dendrimer at all, let alone a blend of two different organometallic dendrimers A and

B as defined in claim 1. None of the dendrimers in the blends P and Q is organometallic.

The Office Action refers to the passages at column 16, line 56 through column 17, line 5, and column 19, lines 11-28 of Tomalia et al., and states that these passages teach that "the dendrimer can comprise metal chelates".

First, however, a "metal chelate" is not necessarily an organometallic compound. Some metal chelates are organometallic chelates (for instance if they contain a metal-carbon bond) whereas many other metal chelates are not. The disclosure in Tomalia et al. of a "metal chelate" does not therefore amount to a teaching of an organometallic dendrimer.

Second, the passages at column 16, line 56 through column 17, line 5, and column 19, lines 11-28 of Tomalia et al. do not teach an organometallic dendrimer because they relate to a conjugate of formula $(P)_x*(M)_y$ (as defined at column 16, lines 35 to 52 of Tomalia et al.) wherein P is a dendrimer and M is a unit of a "carried material". The passages at column 16, line 56 through column 17, line 5, and column 19, lines 11-28 of Tomalia et al. do not relate to the dendrimer component, P, of the conjugate, but to the "carried material", M.

The "metal chelates" referred to in these passages of Tomalia et al. are not therefore part of the dendrimer itself. Rather, they are present in the separate "carried material", M. The passages at column 16, line 56 through column 17, line 5, and column 19, lines 11-28 of Tomalia et al. do not therefore teach an organometallic dendrimer, but only a conjugate of formula $(P)_x*(M)_y$ which comprises a "dendrimer", P, and a "carried material", M, which may comprise a metal chelate. It is clear that Tomalia et al. does not disclose a dendrimer which itself comprises a metal chelate, and Tomalia et al. certainly does not disclose any organometallic dendrimer.

Third, the passages at column 16, line 56 through column 17, line 5, and column 19, lines 11-28 of Tomalia et al. do not relate to mixtures of dendrimers. Rather, as explained above, these passages relate to a single conjugate of the general formula $(P)_x*(M)_y$ (as defined at column 16, lines 35 to

52 of Tomalia et al.). These passages certainly do not therefore disclose a composition comprising a mixture of at least two different dendrimers, A and B, both of which are organometallic dendrimers.

Tomalia et al. does not therefore disclose a composition comprising a mixture of at least two different dendrimers, A and B, which are both organometallic dendrimers, as required by amended claim 1.

Moreover, regardless of these other issues, in view of the above amendment, Tomalia et al. also does not disclose a composition comprising a mixture of at least two different dendrimers, A and B, which are both phosphorescent dendrimers, as required by amended claim 1.

As explained above, the only sections of Tomalia et al. which relate to combinations of different dendrimers are col. 44, lines 37 to 42 and columns 104-105 (Example 42).

However, the passage at col. 44, lines 37 to 42 of Tomalia et al., which refers to "combinations of two different size dendrimers complexed with DNA", does not provide any information as to the chemical structures of the two different dendrimers in the combinations referred to. It is therefore impossible to conclude that the dendrimers in the combination are phosphorescent. That passage certainly does not therefore disclose a composition comprising a mixture of at least two different dendrimers, A and B, which are both phosphorescent dendrimers.

As for Example 42 (columns 104-105) of Tomalia et al., that describes blends of dendrimers P and Q. As explained above, the only information given about the structures of the dendrimers in blends P and Q is the generation number (which varies from G1 to G6) and the initiator core (which is either EDA or NH_3). These initiator cores however are not phosphorescent. Furthermore, because no detail is given as to the structures of the dendrons (repeating units) of the dendrimers in blends P and Q, it is impossible to conclude that both of the dendrimers in the combination are phosphorescent. Clearly, therefore, Example 42 of Tomalia et al. does not disclose any phosphorescent dendrimer at all, let

alone a blend of two different phosphorescent dendrimers A and B as defined in claim 1. None of the dendrimers in the blends P and Q is phosphorescent.

It should also be noted that PAMAM (polyamidoamine) dendrons would not themselves confer phosphorescence on a dendrimer, because (as explained above) they are made up of saturated, non-conjugated alkylene linking groups.

It is therefore clear that Tomalia et al. does not disclose a composition comprising a mixture of at least two different dendrimers, A and B, which are both phosphorescent dendrimers, as required by amended claim 1.

The Office Action nonetheless refers to the passages at column 16, line 56 through column 17, line 5, and column 19, lines 11-28 of Tomalia et al., and states that these passages "teach the dendrimers can include fluorescent and phosphorescent emitting entities".

First, however, the passages at column 16, line 56 through column 17, line 5, and column 19, lines 11-28 of Tomalia et al. do not teach a phosphorescent dendrimer because they relate to a conjugate of formula $(P)_x*(M)_y$ (as defined at column 16, lines 35 to 52 of Tomalia et al.) wherein P is a dendrimer and M is a unit of a "carried material". The passages at column 16, line 56 through column 17, line 5, and column 19, lines 11-28 of Tomalia et al. do not relate to the dendrimer component, P, of the conjugate, but to the "carried material" component, M. The "phosphorescent entities" referred to in these passages of Tomalia et al. are not therefore part of the dendrimer itself. Rather, they are present in the separate "carried material", M.

The passages at column 16, line 56 through column 17, line 5, and column 19, lines 11-28 of Tomalia et al. do not therefore teach a phosphorescent dendrimer, but only a conjugate of formula $(P)_x*(M)_y$ which comprises a "dendrimer" component, P, and a different "carried material" component, M, which "carried material" component may comprise a "phosphorescent entity". It is therefore clear that Tomalia et al. does not disclose a dendrimer which is itself phosphorescent, but only a separate "carried material" which

may comprise a "phosphorescent entity". Tomalia et al. does not therefore disclose a "phosphorescent dendrimer".

Third, the passages at column 16, line 56 through column 17, line 5, and column 19, lines 11-28 of Tomalia et al. do not relate to mixtures of dendrimers. Rather, as explained above, these passages relate to a single conjugate of the general formula $(P)_x*(M)_y$ (as defined at column 16, lines 35 to 52 of Tomalia et al.). These passages certainly do not therefore disclose a composition comprising a mixture of at least two different dendrimers, A and B, both of which are phosphorescent dendrimers.

It is therefore clear that Tomalia et al. does not disclose a composition comprising a mixture of at least two different dendrimers, A and B, which are both phosphorescent dendrimers, as required by amended claim 1.

In conclusion, Tomalia et al. does not disclose any of the following elements of the composition in claim 1 (all of which are required to anticipate):

(i) a mixture of at least two different dendrimers A and B, which have a different generation number and/or different number of dendrons but the same core and the same repeating units;

(ii) a mixture of at least two different dendrimers A and B, which have at least one inherently at least partially conjugated dendron;

(iii) a mixture of at least two different dendrimers A and B, which are both organometallic; and

(iv) a mixture of at least two different dendrimers A and B, which are both phosphorescent.

Tomalia et al. therefore should not be held to anticipate the composition defined in amended claim 1, which comprises all of the above elements in combination, namely a composition which comprises mixture of at least two different dendrimers, A and B, which:

- have the same core and repeating units but a different generation number and/or different number of dendrons; and

- have at least one inherently at least partially conjugated dendron; and

- are both phosphorescent, organometallic dendrimers.

Nothing about the evidence provided in the Britannica Online or IUPAC excerpt evidenced anything to the contrary. Hence, the anticipation rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-17 should therefore be withdrawn.

Further, the declaration evidence described below establishes surprising unobvious advantages of the present invention which are not achieved by the cited purportedly anticipatory art.

§ 103 Rejections

A. The present inventors have surprisingly found that the use of a mixture of at least two phosphorescent organometallic dendrimers, A and B, having:

- the same core and the same repeating unit, but different generations of dendrons and/or different numbers of dendrons; and

- at least one inherently at least partially conjugated dendron,

leads to unexpected improvements in the efficiency of opto-electronic devices. These unexpected advantages of the claimed compositions are evidenced by the declaration by the co-inventor, Professor Paul Burn, filed on 10 July 2009.

The comparative data attached to that declaration as Exhibit 2 show that the compositions of the invention provide major efficiency advantages compared with prior art compositions. As is stated in the declaration, there are clear and significant improvements in efficiency when compositions of the invention are used compared with prior art compositions. The present invention therefore solves the problem of providing organic light emitting devices with improved efficiency and, potentially, lifetime. These results could not have been predicted in view of the prior art. They were therefore surprising and unexpected results. Hence, in addition to these specific distinctions, any assertion of obviousness is believed overcome by the declaration.

Moreover, it is submitted that the showing of the declaration is commensurate in scope with the claims, because the dendrimers A and B in the claimed composition are both

phosphorescent organometallic dendrimers, and the declaration shows the surprising advantages of using a composition comprising a mixture of phosphorescent, organometallic dendrimers, A and B, as defined in claim 1, over prior art compositions which comprise only a single such dendrimer.

B. Turning specifically to consider the first obviousness rejection, claims 1, 3-6, 11-14 and 16 were held obvious based on Inoue et al., as further evidenced by the IUPAC excerpt.

Claim 1 has now however been amended to incorporate the subject matter of previous claims 10 and 17, i.e. to recite that the dendrimers A and B in the claimed composition are "phosphorescent organometallic dendrimers". That rejection is not applied against those claims. The rejection of obviousness based on Inoue et al., as further evidenced by the IUPAC excerpt, is accordingly now moot.

For the avoidance of doubt, it is noted that Inoue et al. neither teaches nor suggests a phosphorescent organometallic dendrimer. Rather, the compounds of formula (I) disclosed in Inoue et al. are simple organic compounds, which do not contain any metal atoms. They are certainly not therefore "organometallic dendrimers". They are not phosphorescent either. As the Examiner has noted on page 7 of the Office Action, "Inoue does not teach the phosphorescent light emitting properties of the compounds of formula (I)."

The Examiner has maintained that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a combination of a plurality of compounds of formula (I) of Inoue et al. Applicants respectfully disagree, for the reasons given in the Applicants' previous responses, filed in July 2009 and May 2010. Furthermore, such a combination of a plurality of compounds of formula (I) of Inoue et al. does not in any case fall within the scope of claim 1 as now amended because, as mentioned above, none of said compounds of formula (I) is a phosphorescent organometallic dendrimer.

There is therefore no teaching or suggestion in Inoue et al. of the claimed composition of at least two different phosphorescent organometallic dendrimers. Accordingly, the

composition as defined in claim 1 as now amended, or as defined in any of the dependent claims 3-6, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 16, would not have been obvious in view of Inoue et al. Reconsideration of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

C. With respect to the second obviousness rejection, claims 2, 8-10, 24, 26-28 and 35-39 were rejected as being obvious in view of Inoue et al. with further evidence from the IUPAC excerpt, further in view of Baldo et al.

Claim 1 has now however been amended to incorporate the subject matter of previous claims 10 and 17, i.e. to recite that the dendrimers A and B in the claimed composition are "phosphorescent organometallic dendrimers". Again, this rejection was not applied as against those claims. Hence, this rejection is also believed overcome.

For the avoidance of doubt, it is noted that neither Inoue et al. nor Baldo et al. teaches or suggests a phosphorescent organometallic dendrimer. Rather, as explained above, the compounds of formula (I) disclosed in Inoue et al. are simple organic compounds, which do not contain any metal atoms. They are certainly not therefore "organometallic dendrimers". They are not phosphorescent either. As the Examiner has noted on page 7 of the Office Action, "Inoue does not teach the phosphorescent light emitting properties of the compounds of formula (I)." Baldo et al. also does not disclose any phosphorescent organometallic dendrimer.

The Examiner has maintained that one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected the higher generation dendrimers of Inoue to exhibit "similar phosphorescent properties of the generation 1 dendrimer, TPD" disclosed in Baldo et al., and that it would additionally have been obvious to use these dendrimers as host materials in the light emitting layer as taught by Baldo et al. with the expectation that the materials would provide light emission and high hole mobility. Applicants respectfully disagree, for the reasons given in the Applicants' previous responses, filed in July 2009 and May 2010.

Furthermore, such a combination of compounds from Inoue

et al. and Baldo et al. does not in any case fall within the scope of claim 1 as now amended because, as mentioned above, none of the compounds of formula (I) from Inoue et al. and none of the compounds disclosed in Baldo et al., including TPD, is a "phosphorescent organometallic dendrimer". In other words, Inoue et al. and Baldo et al. cannot be combined in order to arrive at the claimed composition, because neither document teaches or suggests the use of a phosphorescent organometallic dendrimer, let alone a composition comprising a mixture of at least two phosphorescent, organometallic dendrimers, A and B, having the same core and the same repeating unit, but different generations of dendrons and/or different numbers of dendrons, and at least one inherently at least partially conjugated dendron.

The composition of phosphorescent organometallic dendrimers defined in claim 1 as now amended, or as defined in dependent claim 2, would not therefore have been obvious over Inoue et al. in view of Baldo et al. It follows that the organic light emitting devices defined in claims 24, 26-28 and 35-38, and the photovoltaic device defined in claim 39, all of which comprise a composition as claimed in claim 1, also would not have been obvious over Inoue et al. in view of Baldo et al. Reconsideration of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

As such, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested of the remaining amended claims. Enclosed is a three-month extension petition together with an RCE request. These permit the above issues to be considered without the procedural restrictions of after final practice.

Apart from the three-month extension fee and the RCE fee, no additional fees are believed necessary for the entry of this amendment. However, if any are, please charge Deposit Account 17-0055 for the amount of the fee.

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL L. BURN ET AL.

Dated: December 23, 2010 By: _____

Carl R. Schwartz, Esq.
Reg. No.: 29,437
Quarles & Brady LLP
411 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
(414) 277-5715

MKE/10743397.1